## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA GREENVILLE DIVISION

Vanessa Maria Johnson Williams,	)
Plaintiff,	) C.A. No. 6:21-2632-HMH-KFM
vs.	OPINION & ORDER
U.S. Federal Government, Greenville	)
County and State, God Holy Spirit, FBI	)
Government Headquarters, Justice	)
Department, Greenville County	)
Detention Center, Social Security Office	)
Headquarters,	)
	)
Defendants.	)

This matter is before the court for review of the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina. Vanessa Maria Johnson Williams ("Plaintiff"), proceeding pro se, filed this action alleging violations of her constitutional rights. In his Report and Recommendation issued August 27, 2021, Magistrate Judge McDonald recommends dismissing this case without issuance and service of process. (R&R, generally, ECF No. 9.) The Report and Recommendation was mailed to the Plaintiff and returned to the court as undeliverable on September 13, 2021. After receiving no objections, the court adopted the Report and Recommendation in an order dated September 14, 2021. (Order, ECF No. 14.)

The Plaintiff contacted the clerk's office on September 20, 2021, stating that she did not receive the Report and Recommendation. The same day, the Plaintiff presented to the

clerk's office and obtained a copy of the Report and Recommendation. (Clerk's Entry, ECF No. 21.) Subsequently, the Plaintiff filed objections and a motion for reconsideration on September 27, 2021. Because the Plaintiff did not receive the Report and Recommendation, the court will consider her objections as timely. Thus, the previous order adopting the Report and Recommendation is vacated.

The court has thoroughly reviewed the Plaintiff's objections to the Report and Recommendation. Objections to the Report and Recommendation must be specific. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party's right to further judicial review, including appellate review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See

<u>United States v. Schronce</u>, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of <u>specific</u> objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. <u>See Camby v. Davis</u>, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Plaintiff's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate her claims. Accordingly, the court finds that Plaintiff's objections are without merit. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge McDonald's Report and Recommendation and incorporates it herein by reference.

It is therefore

**ORDERED** that the court's September 14, 2021 order is vacated. It is further

**ORDERED** that this case is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. It is further

**ORDERED** that the motion for reconsideration, docket number 22, is denied as moot because the court considered the Plaintiff's objections as timely.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr. Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina October 5, 2021

## NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The Plaintiff is hereby notified that she has the right to appeal this order within sixty (60) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.